

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

This application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action dated September 3, 2008. Claims 1 through 7 are currently active in this case. Claims 8 through 45 have been withdrawn from consideration. Reconsideration of this application is respectfully requested.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the withdrawal of finality of the last Office Action, as well as entry of the submission of June 17, 2008.

Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's detection of the typographical error that occurred in the preparation of Claim 1, in which the word "retrieved" should have been underlined. This paper corrects the error.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 1 because line 5 contains a typographical error. Applicants gratefully acknowledge the Examiner's detection of the typographical error that occurred in the preparation of Claim 1, in which the word "table" should have been inserted on line 5. This paper corrects the error.

The Examiner has objected to Claim 4 at line 4. Applicants note that they may be their own lexicographers. In particular, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 9, line 12, where Applicants expressly use the word "subdividing" to describe their method, i.e., that portion of the specification provides for "subdividing the plurality of signature color data lookup tables into classes of signature color data lookup tables 72 based on a color similarity." Applicants agree with the Examiner, however, that "dividing" is a more accurate description of the disclosed method using commonly accepted definitions, and have amended Claim 4 to provide for dividing the plurality of signature color data lookup tables. Claim 4 should also have been amended to depend from Claim 1 in the last Amendment, and not Claim 2, and this Amendment provides for such dependency. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to Claim 4 are requested.

Claims 1 and 3 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph. Claim 1 has been amended along the lines the Examiner suggested. As amended, Claim 1 now provides for

generating a plurality of signature color data lookup tables based on the color data for a plurality of the imaging objects of a same type, wherein the size of the signature color data lookup table is smaller than the size of the standard color conversion lookup table. Claim 3 has been correspondingly amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, are requested.

Claims 1 and 2 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102 over the Bowers U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0126301 [hereinafter referred to as "Bowers"]. Claim 1 has been amended to provide for generating a plurality of signature color data lookup tables based on the color data for a plurality of the imaging objects of a same type, wherein the size of the signature color data lookup table is smaller than the size of the standard color conversion lookup table, and dividing the plurality of signature color data lookup tables for the plurality of imaging objects of the same type into classes of signature color data lookup tables. As amended, Claim 1, and dependent claims, are believed patentably to distinguish over Bowers and the other cited art.

Bowers discloses a method of providing calibration data to a printer to produce a corrected color value. An ink cartridge has a memory for storing values measured from selected printers and from selected print substrate that is used to compute a color adjustment value to correct the output color data to equal the input color data.

With respect to amended Claim 1, Bowers neither suggests nor discloses a method for correcting color shift in an imaging system having an imaging object, and having a standard color conversion lookup table associated with the imaging object, comprising the steps of measuring a plurality of test patches to obtain color data associated with the imaging object, generating a plurality of signature color data lookup tables based on the color data for a plurality of the imaging objects of a same type, wherein the size of the signature color data lookup table is smaller than the size of the standard color conversion lookup table, and dividing the plurality of signature color data lookup tables for the plurality of imaging objects of the same type into classes of signature color data lookup tables. Bowers is completely silent on the idea of dividing the signature color data lookup tables into classes. Bowers merely looks at individual imaging objects.

Further, Applicants submit that amended Claim 1 is patentably distinguishable over Bowers in view of the Nagatani U.S. Patent Application No. 2002/0126301 A1 [hereinafter referred to as "Nagatani." Nagatani discloses a database for gradation correction in a printer. Nagatani creates a table on the basis of the inherent difference and/or time-lapse change of a printer body and/or the ink head. As the Examiner has noted, Nagatani's database can be used for lookup tables for color correction in addition to gradation correction. While the data in Nagatani's database can be organized by head rank, this is not the same as Applicants' invention, which provides for dividing the plurality of signature color data lookup tables for the plurality of imaging objects of the same type into classes of signature color data lookup tables. In applicants' invention, the classes may be for a printer cartridge, a substrate, or a scanner. Applicants' classes are not the same as Nagatani's head rank listings. Applicants' classes relate to signature color data lookup tables and are based on color similarity. Nagatani's database merely relates to a particular printing head or heads, and certainly is not based on color similarity. Thus Nagatani does not remedy the defects of Bowers. Accordingly, amended Claim 1, and dependent Claims 2 to 7, are believed patentable over the cited references, and their allowance is requested.

Claim 3 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bowers in view of the Balasubramanian et al. United States Patent No. 5,739,927 [hereinafter referred to as "Balasubramanian". This rejection, as applied to Claim 3, which depends from amended Claim 1, is respectfully traversed.

Balasubramanian discloses a color imaging system with a color correction table connected to a printer. According to Balasubramanian, a set of refinement colors is selected to determine the accuracy of the system. The number of refinement colors selected is small in relation to the number of locations in the color correction table. Balasubramanian does not remedy the defects of Bowers and Nagatani as discussed above in regard to amended Claim 1, from which Claim 3 now depends. Accordingly, Claim 3 is believed allowable, and such action is requested.

Claim 4 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bowers and Nagatani. Claim 4 depends from Claim 1, and has been amended to reflect the changes made to Claim 1, i.e., to remove redundant language. For the reasons advanced above with respect to Claim 1, Claim 4 is also believed allowable, and such action is requested.

Claims 5 to 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 over Bowers and Nagatani. The Examiner recognizes that the cited references do not meet the language of the claims. Further, as noted above, Claims 5 to 7 depend from Claim 1. Thus, for the reasons advanced above with respect to that claim, Claims 5 to 7 are believed patentable, and their allowance is requested.

Applicants appreciated the Examiner's acknowledgement that the Chu, Chan, and Oshikawa documents do not render Applicants' invention unpatentable.

In view of the above discussion and amendments, it is respectfully submitted that the present application is in condition for allowance. Therefore, reconsideration and allowance are requested.

Should the Examiner wish to discuss any of the amendments and/or remarks made herein, the undersigned attorney would appreciate the opportunity to do so.

In the event Applicants have overlooked any fees for the extension of time, an additional extension of time, payment of fee, or additional payment of fee, Applicants conditionally petition therefor, and authorize that any charges be made to Account No. 12-1213.

Respectfully submitted,

/Elizabeth C. Jacobs/

Electronically filed

Elizabeth C. Jacobs
Reg. No. 34,189
Attorney for Applicants

Docket No. 2003-0269.02